DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 802 HE 017 670

AUTHOR Winship, Addison L., II, Comp.
TITLE The Quest for Major Gifts: A Survey of 68 Institutions.
INSTITUTION Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89964-229-2
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 61p.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 11 Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 ($16.50, prepaid).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Presidents; *Endowment Funds; *Financial Support; *Fund Raising; Institutional Advancement; *Postsecondary Education; Private Colleges; Proprietary Schools; Questionnaires; School Surveys; State Universities; Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS Endowed Chairs

ABSTRACT

Information on how universities, colleges, and independent schools solicit major gifts is presented, based on results of a survey of 68 institutions. The pattern among institutions was to define major gifts as those $100,000 and up, while leadership gifts ranged from $10,000 to $100,000. Thirty-eight of the schools had one or more professionals working full time on major gifts; thirty of the 38 schools had two or more major gifts staff. Of the schools that have no major gift officer, the responsibility for seeking such gifts rested with the president (headmaster), trustee and key volunteers, and the chief development officer. The effectiveness of volunteers versus senior institutional officers was also assessed. Major gifts were obtained in roughly the following percentages for the three soliciting groups: volunteers (39 percent), presidents or headmasters (38 percent), and development officers (23 percent). The median price for an endowed professorship was $750,000. Thirty-six of 53 respondents said that at least half the cost of a building must be gifted to name it for the donor. Appendices include the questionnaire, a list of the participating institutions, total responses for each questionnaire item, along with comments. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248802

The Quest for Major Gifts

A Survey of 68 Institutions

Compiled by Addison L. Winship II
Vice President Emeritus
Dartmouth College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CASE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE017 670

© 1984 by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education
Suite 400, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036
ISBN 0-89964-229-2

FOREWORD

At CASE, we stay alert to questions members are asking because these questions indicate your areas of concern and interest. Within the past couple of years, we've been hearing more and more often, "How much do other institutions require before establishing named professorships?" and "What are typical policies on naming buildings for donors?" Unfortunately, we've lacked in-depth information with which to answer these questions.

In the fall of 1983, CASE approached Addison Winship of Dartmouth about conducting a survey to collect data on these topics. He thought over the matter and suggested a broader survey covering the organization, staffing, and policies of major gift programs. We immediately saw the wisdom of this approach and encouraged him to move ahead.

The speed, insight, and efficiency with which he formulated the questionnaire, conducted the survey, and wrote the report are typical of Winship. They tell a lot about why the Dartmouth development program, in which he has worked for 25 years and which he has headed for 18 years, is a national leader.

Decisions about how to conduct a major gifts program will continue to be individual institutional decisions. What's right for the school, college, or university down the road may not be right for your institution. We hope, however, that you'll be able to make better decisions about your own program after you read this monograph.

Virginia Carter Smith
Vice President, CASE

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Analysis of the Data 1

1. Major Gifts Defined

2. Staffing for Major Gifts

3. Solicitation of Major Gifts

4. Endowed Professorships and Other Specific Endowments

5. Gifts for Facilities

6. Conclusion

III. Exhibit A - The Survey Questionnaire 7

Exhibit B - Respondent Institutions Alpha by Type 14

Exhibit C - The Tally of Responses - Complete with Comments 15

INTRODUCTION

The quest for major gifts today is everybody's business - small institutions and large, private and public, secondary and graduate. The quest is ongoing, both during and in between campaigns. Many more people are involved in the process than in earlier times when perhaps only the president was engaged on occasion in the cultivation and solicitation of large gifts.

In an attempt to gauge how institutions are approaching their quests for major gifts, this survey has been conducted of a cross-cut of CASE member institutions. One hundred and eighteen questionnaires were sent. Sixty-eight (58%) were completed and returned.

While there are significant common threads in the findings, the widely disparate shapes, sizes and colorations of institutions surveyed caution against categorical surmise. What is right, or works well, for one type of institution is not necessarily right for another.

Tallies are presented for the cross-cut as a whole. Comments and explanations, however, are grouped by categories of institutions and should be of useful value to those interested in the experience of institutions of like type.

To provide the reader with the widest latitude for self-interpretation of the data, this monograph includes a reprint of the original questionnaire as sent, and also a full reprint of the tallies of responses, including comments.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

1. Major Gifts Defined

Despite an oft-times confusing transposition of the words major and leadership in campaign parlance, there seems to be no confusion about major denoting larger gifts. Over 90% of the respondents use that word in a general if not always specific sense.

Half of the respondents break major gifts into two or more categories - usually called major, leadership, special or key, in whatever order. While there is no pronounced pattern, among larger institutions the broad category of major gifts tends to start at $10,000. Of those who make a distinction within the broad category, the nearest thing to a pattern is:

Major gifts - $100,000 and up
Leadership Gifts - $10,000 up to $100,000

For most institutions source, purpose, or form of gift is not a factor in their definition. A major gift relates primarily to size, not from whom it comes, for what it will be used, or whether outright or deferred.

Whatever lack of uniformity of definition the survey discloses, perhaps the significant thing is that virtually all of the respondent institutions indeed are in the business of seeking major gifts, increasingly and continuously so.

2. Staffing for Major Gifts

Thirty-eight (58%) of the respondents do have one or more professionals working full time on major gifts. As might be expected, the larger institutions almost all do (six of eight of the public universities and eight of ten of the major private universities). Full-time major gift professionals are still less common among private secondary schools or the coeducational colleges, but the number is growing.

Note that almost half the respondents (32) at present are in a campaign. Of that number, 27 do have at least one full-time major gift professional and all expect to retain that office(r) after the campaign.

A significant finding is that many institutions have more than one major gift professional. Thirty of the 38 have two or more. Fifteen have four or more, up to a high of 17 major gift professionals at one large university.

One of the reasons for the surprisingly high number of professionals working on major gifts is the presence of deferred gifts professionals in the picture. Fifty-three (78%) of the 68 respondents do have one or more deferred gift professionalson their staffs, and 24 of them count their deferred gift people as "full-time major gift professionals." Deferred (planned) gift offices have been well entrenched for a number of years in the overall development organizations of institutions of all sizes.

A surprise in the survey is that 40 of the 53 institutions reporting deferred gifts professionals have only one such officer, and only one has more than two. Hence, with one exception, the 15 larger institutions that now have four or more major gift professionals have two or fewer deferred gifts professionals.

The data immediately above are of interest to those in development who believe strongly in wedding deferred gifts and major gifts professionals into one office within their organizations. Obviously some of that is happening - in almost half the cases. The analyst is aware from sources other than this survey that development management generally favors such a merger, on the grounds that anyone working in the area of major gifts should have at minimum a fairly sophisticated understanding of tax-wise charitable gift matters and estate planning, and one working in the deferred gifts area should be more than a technician - in fact ideally should be a good "customer person." And it simply is not good fund raising to "pigeon hole" many prospects as one or the other - outright gift prospects or deferred gift prospects.

Of the 28 respondents who have no major gift office(r) as such, the responsibility for seeking such gifts rests much as expected, with the president (headmaster), trustee and key volunteers, and the chief development officer. If there is anything of significance in the responses, it is that so few deans and faculty are indicated as carrying a responsibility for major gift fund raising.

The survey affirms a strong present trend for institutions of all sizes to include on their staffs professionals whose full-time responsibility is for major gifts, both during and between campaigns.

3. Solicitation of Major Gifts

Exactly half (34) of the respondents indicate that their presidents (headmasters) achieve the greatest degree of success in terms of major gift dollars raised for their institutions. The remainder with but few exceptions rate the president highly, if not first.

Senior development officers also are rated strongly, not far behind their presidents. That should not be surprising, yet it carries a message to those who feel that senior development officers should be managers and orchestrators, but not solicitors. Note also that five institutions cited their deferred gift officer as their highest achiever; and six cited their major gift development officer.

It is not readily apparent that volunteers are less high achievers than the senior institutional officers cited above. At first glance the scaled ranking table (Page C - 12) positions them relatively low on the scale, but the survey listed four closely related categories of volunteers, which tended to divide the weighted scores. While volunteers generally are not the number one achievers, their collective efforts at the board and volunteer level are strong.

That interpretation is borne out by the next two questions of the survey, which show that collectively volunteers produce about 39% of the major gift realization, while presidents (headmasters) are estimated to produce about 38%. While those are unscientific figures - guesstimates, if you will, not weighted to reflect disparity in the size and type of schools in the sample - we nevertheless feel they probably are close to the true situation. They say, effectually, that given a large enough sampling of all institutions, major gifts are obtained in roughly the following percentages by the three principal soliciting groups:

Volunteers	39%
Presidents (Headmasters)	38%
Development Officers	23%

Of equal or greater importance is the question of team solicitation. Fund raisers live by the maxim that two-on-one solicitations generally are preferable, though that rule as a matter of practice is violated all too frequently.

Over 80% of the respondents say that at least 25% of their solicitations are made two-on-one. The median and the average of all responses claim that slightly more than half of their solicitations are two-on-one.

Combinations of the principals in such two-on-one solicitations are practically endless. Of the choices offered in the survey, the president and a trustee is the combination most often checked (18%), with the president and the senior development officer next (9%). Consistent with earlier findings, the pool from which solicitors generally come consists primarily of presidents, development staff and volunteers.

It is reassuring, in the face of some claims to the contrary, that 44 institutions feel that volunteer effectiveness is increasing, and that only six feel it is decreasing.

A fault of the survey is its failure to specifically list faculty as an option for the questions in this section. But deans were listed, and write-in options were available. By default or otherwise, the responses suggest that institutions as a rule are not getting as high fund-raising achievement from their senior academic officers as they might.

Finally, the comments offered in this section of the survey are numerous and varied. Readers of the monograph looking for succor or solace will find it, in several forms. We detect no new wheels, and are reassured that most of the phenomena really aren't. Established principles generally prevail.

4. Endowed Professorships and Other Specific Endowments

Inevitably the size of gifts sought for the more traditional endowments will vary with type and size of institution. This portion of the survey perhaps will be of greatest value for the range and variety of endowments cited.

The median price for an endowed professorship, of the 66 respondents to the question, is $750,000, with the average slightly less. Perhaps of significance is the fact that most of the major private universities in recent years have broken the million-dollar standard and now are asking for more. It is worthy of note that a majority of respondents have increased their maximum asking price for a chair within the past five years.

Not surprisingly, 38 institutions (57%) acknowledge that their minimum is negotiable. Explanations vary, and just as frequently involve negotiable terms and conditions other than price itself.

About one-third of the respondents have two or more classes of endowed professorships and again, the explanatory comments range widely and tend to the familiar.

About one-third will not fill a chair until it is fully funded, and it is apparent that of the majority who will fill a chair before fully funded, that action is limited to existing positions. Standards with respect to incremental chairs appear to be high - in fact it is our interpretation of the data that there simply is not a heavy traffic in incremental chairs.

Editorially, we are somewhat surprised that only 12 institutions will fill a chair now in recognition of a gift made subject to life income. The question did not distinguish between existing positions and incremental positions, true. But neither did the 41 negative respondents raise that question. Such a gift is irrevocably made, and the chance to give lifetime gratification to the donor costs nothing and could be rewarding.

There are 47 negative respondents to the question of filling a chair now for a documented bequest provision. Apparently there is a prevailing sense that documentation is not necessarily binding, if indeed legal.

The survey section on "other endowments" produced a not surprising potpourri, the listing of which on page C - 31 may provide a few new thoughts for endowment shopping lists. One helpful observation - only a few of the institutions surveyed indicate acceptance of endowment funds less than $5,000.

5. Gifts for Facilities

The final question of this section asks if it is more difficult to raise funds for facilities now than in the past, and the responses by a slight majority are yes.

Perhaps that is a factor in the wide range of comments noted, the common thread of which is that policies are loose at the outset, and generally negotiable.

Thirty-six of 53 respondents say that at least half the cost of a building must be gifted to name it for the donor. Most of them require only 50%, or at least 51%. The comments say much about the lack of standards.

Fewer than half include an endowment for operating and/or maintenance in pricing a building, though comments underscore the growing concern of institutional management to include such costs.

6. Conclusion

The sample of institutions surveyed was somewhat random, if not totally so. A degree of consideration was given to fund-raising success, particularly with respect to the smaller colleges and the secondary schools. There is little point in asking low achievers what they are doing about major gifts.

Given the slight skewing of the sample, it is clear that those institutions of whatever type who actively seek to raise gifts of major size are involving many people in the process. There is a strong trend to full-time professionals on major gifts, whether outright or deferred. The quest in no sense is limited to periods of campaign. Just as deferred gift specialists have in the past two decades become standard fixtures on development staffs, so now are major gifts professionals.

The survey affirms the importance of institutional leaders to the development effort. Notorious though many of our presidents are for their disclaimers of fund-raising prowess, most institutions look to them to take the lead, and apparently they are doing so - successfully. This may be nothing new, but the affirmation is welcome.

Similarly, chief development officers and their senior development associates are very much on the front lines. The survey did not measure the dynamics of that, but we suspect that development staff involvement in high gift level solicitation is on the increase.

Voluntarism has been charged in some quarters as diminishing (and that fact, if true, has been used to explain the need for greater professional staff participation in solicitation). The survey suggests otherwise. There may be a reordering of the respective roles, with professional staff moving more prominently into front-line positions, but there is no general sense of less voluntarism.

The survey also suggests that asking prices for the usual endowments may not be keeping pace with inflation, and it suggests an insufficiency of standards in the funding of facilities. Yet those items as well as others are actively on the agenda at many institutions.

Though there is a bit of the confessional in the responses - an acknowledgment of delay in adopting new practices - there definitely is a general tenor of activity and optimism, a recognition that there is a job to be done and a sense of how to do it.

Inevitably a survey of this sort provides inadequate opportunity for full expression and thoughtful exchange. Most of the respondents could add much more from their experience than a "yes or no - short comment, please" format permits. Note, for example, the quality judgment which Cornell University's respondent put into the last question on Survey Page 5. That could launch a seminar, or be a chapter in a book.

In requesting and publishing these data, CASE appropriately recognizes the emerging importance of major gifts as a discrete activity to be synthesized into development operations along with annual funds, deferred gifts and periodic campaign programs.

ADDISON L. WINSHIP II

MAJOR GIFTS
SURVEY

Development or advancement programs at our schools, colleges and universities have for years enjoyed the benefit of studies, analyses and papers about the traditional programs - annual funds, capital campaigns, deferred gifts operations, or corporations and foundations programs. But the one area that has only recently come into the spotlight for study as a discrete development program is Major Gifts.

This study is an effort to collect and report data on how our institutions are going about achieving an ongoing flow of major gifts, during campaigns and most especially in non-campaign periods. It also addresses related matters of policy with respect to gifts for professorships, facilities and so forth.

In preparing this monograph, it is not our intent to prescribe with specificity what a major gift is. We realize it means different things to different people and to different institutions. We use the term generically, with the hope and expectation that for most people involved in institutional fund raising there is a sufficiently common denominator to serve the purposes of our study. To the extent that a more precise definition by each correspondent will be useful to our interpretations, we do begin with a brief effort to understand your institutional definition.

Conducted by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. Findings to be summarized and edited by Addison L. Winship, Vice President, Dartmouth College, and published by CASE as one of its series of monographs.

PLEASE IDENTIFY YOURSELF AND YOUR INSTITUTION

_____
Institution

_____
By

COMPLETED SURVEY SHOULD BE MAILED TO: Addison L. Winship
Vice President for Alumni Affairs
& Development
Dartmouth College
224 Blunt Alumni Center
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

(A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience)

YOUR INSTITUTION'S MAJOR GIFT DEFINITION

1. Do you use the word "Major" to denote larger gifts? Y ☐ N ☐

   If no, what is your equivalent word? _____

2. Do you divide larger gifts into two or more categories? Y ☐ N ☐

   If yes, by what names, and what are the distinctions? _____

   _____

   _____

3. Is size of gift a factor in your definition? Y ☐ N ☐

   If yes, what is your minimum? _____

4. Beyond the size factor, do your Major (or your equivalent)* Gifts by your definition come from the following sources: (check as many as appropriate)

   Individuals ☐
   Corporations ☐
   Foundations ☐

   and can they be for the following purposes:

   Current Use ☐
   Plant ☐
   Endowment ☐

   and can they be made in the form of:

   Outright Gifts ☐
   Trusts ☐
   Bequests ☐

5. Please add your further comments if the above does not serve adequately to describe what you mean by Major Gifts, or their semantic equivalent.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

* For the rest of the survey, read "or your equivalent" for "Major"

STAFFING FOR MAJOR GIFTS

Most institutions, particularly of smaller size, have not in the past included on their development staffs professionals whose sole responsibility is for Major Gifts. Responsibility for such gifts usually has rested with the senior development officer working closely with the president, deans and trustees. In recent years campaigns have changed that to a large degree, and now even in non-campaign periods many institutions are forming ongoing offices for Major or Capital Gifts.

Data in response to the following questions can be of considerable use to institutions contemplating such staffing.

1. Do you have one or more professionals working full time on Major Gifts? Y ☐ N ☐

   How many? _____

2. Are you at present in a campaign? Y ☐ N ☐

   If in a campaign, do you expect you will retain your Major Gifts office, or its equivalent, after the campaign? Y ☐ N ☐

3. Do you have one or more deferred (planned) gift professionals on your staff? Y ☐ N ☐

   How many? _____

   Are your deferred gift officers included in the number of professionals in (1) above? Y ☐ N ☐

4. If you have no Major Gift office as such, please check the following people whose positions carry a responsibility for that function.

Vice President for Development	☐	Faculty	☐
Director of Development	☐	Trustees	☐
President (Headmaster)	☐	Key Volunteers	☐
Deans	☐	Other (specify)	_____
Regional or Field Staff	☐	_____	
		_____	
		_____	

5. Please add further comments or explanations pertinent to your staffing for Major Gifts.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1. Whether you have Major Gift professionals on your staff or not, someone is doing the cultivating and soliciting of your top prospects. Please indicate, as appropriately as you can, the rank or order in which the following are actively engaged in the actual solicitation of Major Gifts for your institution. Be guided by dollar success, to the best of your ability to judge it, not by volume of calls.

   (Rank 1 to 9, 1 being highest total dollars raised)

Sr. Development Officer	____	Other Trustees	____
Board Chairman	____	Deans	____
Dev. Committee Chair	____	Other Development Committee Volunteers	____
President	____		
Major Gift Dev. Officer	____	Deferred Gift Officer	____

2. To pick a rough number, what percent of your Major Gift realization over recent years has come from volunteer solicitation? ____%. Since this is difficult to quantify, please add your qualifying comments, if you will. _____

3. Please do the same as above with respect to your president. ____% and your comments.

4. Please estimate what percent of your Major Gift solicitations are made two on one, as opposed to one on one?

   ____% are two on one.

   When two on one, what is your most successful combination? _____

   _____ and _____

5. Over the past few years, do you feel your volunteer (non-paid) effectiveness in raising Major Gifts has:

   Increased ☐

   Decreased ☐

   Stayed about the Same ☐

6. Please add any additional comments on your policies and experiences with regard to the solicitation of major gifts. _____

ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

1. What is your minimum for an endowed professorship? _____

   For approximately how long has that been your minimum? _____

   Is your minimum negotiable? Y ☐ N ☐

   If negotiable, please explain to what degree: _____

   _____

   _____

2. Do you have two or more classes of endowed (full) professorships? Y ☐ N ☐

   If so, please explain the description and price differential: _____

   _____

   _____

3. Do you have a policy for when an endowed chair will be filled? Y ☐ N ☐

   At the time of pledging ☐

   When ____% funded ☐

   Not until totally funded ☐

   Do you fill a chair now for a gift made subject to life income? Y ☐ N ☐

   Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision? Y ☐ N ☐

4. Do you market endowments for other than full professors?

Position	Endowment Required

5. Do you actively market endowments for other purposes or programs, and at what size?

Purpose or Program	Size of Endowment Required

6. Please add further comments about your various kinds of endowment funds.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

GIFTS FOR FACILITIES

1. To name a building, what percent of its cost must be covered by a gift? _____

   If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice? _____

   or, given your policy, to what extent has it been negotiable? _____

2. In pricing a building, do you include an endowment for operating and/or maintenance? Y ☐ N ☐

   In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working? Please explain.

3. Are you finding it easier ☐ or more difficult ☐ to raise funds for facilities?

4. Please add comments which further describe your policies with regard to gifts for facilities.

RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS EXHIBIT B

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

(8 respondents of 19 requested)

Ball State University
University of Delaware
University of Indiana
University of Kentucky
University of Minnesota
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
University of South Florida
University of Tennessee

PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

(17 respondents of 35 requested)

Belmont Hill School
Chatham Hall
The Cranbrook Schools
Culver Educational Foundation
Deerfield Academy
Gilman School
The Hotchkiss School
The Madeira School
The Mercersburg Academy
Miss Porter's School
Phillips Academy
Phillips Exeter Academy
The Taft School
Thacher School
University School
The Westminster School
Woodberry Forest School

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

(10 respondents of 15 requested)

Baylor University
California Institute of Technology
Cornell University
Duke University
George Washington University
Johns Hopkins University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Princeton University
Stanford University
Yale University

PRIVATE COEDUCATIONAL COLLEGES

(25 respondents of 35 requested)

Amherst College
Augustana College (Illinois)
Carleton College
Colgate University
Davidson College
Earlham College
Gonzaga University
Haverford College
Hope College
Hillsdale College
Lafayette College
Lawrence University
Louisiana College
Loyola Marymount University
Macalester College
Mercer University
Middlebury College
Occidental College
Oklahoma City University
Pepperdine University
Pomona College
University of Richmond
Vassar College
Whitman College
Williams College

PRIVATE MEN'S COLLEGES

(1 respondent of 1 requested)

Washington & Lee College

PRIVATE WOMEN'S COLLEGES

(4 respondents of 8 requested)

Bryn Mawr College
Radcliffe College
Smith College
Wellesley College

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

(3 respondents of 5 requested)

Clarkson College of Technology
Harvey Mudd College
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

 EXHIBIT C - 1

- YOUR INSTITUTION'S MAJOR GIFT DEFINITION

1. Do you use the word "major" to denote larger gifts? Yes - 62
No - 6

If no, what is your equivalent word?

Leadership - 3
Special - 2
Key - 1

Six respondents indicated their use of leadership, key or significant alternatively with major.

2. Do you divide larger gifts into two or more categories? Yes - 34
No - 32

If yes, by what names, and what are the distinctions?

Private Secondary Schools

Key/Leadership. (Phillips Exeter Academy)

Major Gifts refers to gifts of $25,000 or more; Special Gifts refers to gifts of $10,000 to $25,000. (Gilman School)

Leadership - $100,000 and up; Major - $50,000-$100,000. (The Thacher School)

Capital Gifts & Endowment Gifts. (The Westminster School)

For annual giving - $5,000+ (Lanterns); for capital giving $25,000-$50,000+ (no name designation). (Chatham Hall)

Leadership - $50,000-$5,000,000; Major - $5,000-$49,999. (Culver Educational Foundation)

Key - $100,000+; Special - $5,000-$99,999. (Woodberry Forest School)

Private Women's Colleges

At present no, but for campaign purposes we plan to use terms Leadership ($100,000+); Key ($25,000-$100,000); Special ($3,000-$25,000). (Smith College)

Major Gifts - $10,000 and up; Special Gifts - $1,500 to $9,999. (Bryn Mawr College)

Private Universities

We have gift clubs at the $10,000, $25,000, $50,000 and $100,000 levels. (George Washington University)

Major, $100,000+; Special, $10,000-$99,999. (California Institute of Technology)

Leadership, $100,000+; Major, $25,000-$100,000. (Princeton University)

We are in transition. We are initiating a Principal Gifts Program seeking gifts of $5 million or more. Currently a Principal Gift prospect has an estimated capacity of $100,000 or more. (Stanford University)

Leadership Gifts ($1,000,000+); Major Gifts ($25,000-$999,999); Special Gifts ($10,000-$24,999). (Duke University)

Major, $100,000+; Leadership, $10,000-$99,999 - over 5 years or less. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Major Gifts, $1,000,000+; Special Gifts, $25,000-$999,999. Size of gift giving potential, rather than gifts actually given, is the basis of determining whether a prospect is a Major or Special Gift prospect. (Cornell University)

Major - $10,000-$100,000; Leadership - $100,000 and up. (Johns Hopkins University

Private Coeducational Colleges

Major Gifts - typically $50,000 and above; Special Gifts - typically $1,000-$50,000. (Augustana College - Ill.)

Our usage is very casual. We sometimes refer to "key" or "pace-setting" gifts to refer to major gifts that are particularly substantial - say six figures and up. (Lawrence University)

Numerically coded in 10 dollar categories according to potential. (Hillsdale College)

Select and Major. Select - $25,000 to $100,000; Major - $100,000 and over. (Davidson College)

Strategic - $100,000+; Advance - $25,000-$99,999; Major - $1,000-$24,999. (Occidental College)

Private Coeducational Colleges

No, but we do have special handling procedures for all of our "seven figure" prospects. (Amherst College)

Bishop's Council $10,000 and up; President's Council $1,000-$9,999. (Oklahoma City University)

Major ($25,000); Leadership ($100,000) - for capital campaign. (Earlham College)

Capital - $10,000 or more; Major - $50,000 or more. (Whitman College)

3 Categories. "A" - $1,000,000 and over; "B" - $500,000-$999,000; "C" - $100,000-$499,000. (Loyola Marymount University)

We talk about major gifts and special gifts or capital gifts. (Carleton College)

Major Gifts - $100,000+; Special Gifts - $25,000-$99,999. (Colgate University)

Public Universities

I. $100,000 and up; II. $25,000-$99,999; III. President's Council, $5,000 and up; IV. Founders Club, $1,000-$4,999; V. Society of 1766, $500-$999; VI. Century Club, $100-$499. (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey)

$25,000-$249,999 Patron; $250,000-$999,999 Benefactor; $1,000,000 - Founder (University of Florida)

Over $10,000; over $150,000; over $1,000,000. They are related to major gift clubs. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Private Men's Colleges

Major: more than $250,000. Leadership: between $100,000 and $250,000. (Washington & Lee College)

Professional Schools

Bequests; Active Capital or Program Gifts. (Worcester Polytechnic Institute)

SURVEY (Contd) - YOUR INSTITUTION'S MAJOR GIFT DEFINITION

3. Is size of gift a factor in your definition?

Yes - 65
No - 3

If yes, what is your minimum?

$ 1,000	3	$ 25,000	18
2,500	1	50,000	8
5,000	7	100,000	6
10,000	19	200,000	1

Three respondents added the qualifier "over a five year period." It is our assumption that most respondents are thinking in terms of a pledge payable over a reasonable period of time, up to five years.

4. Beyond the size factor, do your Major Gifts by your definition come

from which of these sources -	Individuals	63
	Corporations	45
	Foundations	51
or for which of these purposes -	Current Use	53
	Plant	62
	Endowment	64
or made in which of these forms -	Outright gifts	64
	Trusts	64
	Bequests	58

5. Please add your further comments if the foregoing does not serve to adequately describe what you mean by Major Gifts, or their semantic equivalent.

Private Secondary Schools

A major gift for a little school as Thacher is cannot be compared to that which a large university or college might expect. Our present thinking is: $100,000 and above - Leadership Gift (for the Centennial campaign); $50,000 to $99,999 - Major Gift; $10,000 to $49,999 - Special. (The Thacher School)

Private Women's Colleges

In the past we have not counted gifts from foundations, corporations, trusts or bequests as "major gifts." However, in the anticipated campaign we intend to include these categories. (Smith College)

Private Women's Colleges

Major gifts are gifts of $10,000 and above, and in general most everyone understands that to mean gifts from individuals. In other efforts we are not divided according to size of gifts as much. In corporate and foundation efforts there is no separation (same staff deals with size under $10 and over $10,000). The very large approaches are made by president or director of resources. (Bryn Mawr College)

We have an "associates" membership program which is primarily for annual fund gifts. We tend to refer to major gifts as those which should be solicited by the president, a trustee or a member of our development trustee advisory committee of very seasoned solicitors, and may be for capital purposes or program purposes. (Radcliffe College)

Private Universities

These are capital gifts only - not annual giving - where larger gifts are called "special gifts." (Princeton University)

Major Gifts at Yale are gifts of $25,000 or more. Current-use gifts in that category are counted in Alumni Fund totals, separate from "Major Gifts" totals. Major Gifts at Yale is a division for individuals. (Yale University)

Irrevocable non-contingent or realized bequests only. (Duke University)

Special Gifts and Major Gifts programs are defined by the prospects they address. Once a prospect is identified with a program for cultivation and solicitation, all gifts, regardless of amount, from the prospect are credited to the program. Therefore Major Gifts totals include all gifts, trusts, etc., from Major Gift prospects even if they are less than the $1 million level which was the criteria for including the prospect in the program. (Cornell University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

We are making a concentrated effort in planned (deferred) giving - while working with the donor - the present gifts - naturally occur. (Mercer University)

We ascribe "major" to amount, not source or use. (Amherst College)

Bequests are only counted here if they materialize during our campaign. (University of Richmond)

Private Educational Colleges

Current fund gifts (annual) $10,000 is called a leadership gift. (Earlham College)

Public Universities

Generally speaking, the term "major gift" is synonymous with "special gift." We utilize the major gift terms to denote special action, e.g., cultivation, involvement by president and trustees, etc. Also denotes gifts that need special handling with respect to complexity. (University of Delaware)

We are considering hiring or naming a major gifts officer. Otherwise the term is informal, though commonly used. We refer to major gift clubs, but they have other formal names. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Private Men's Colleges

We do not place much emphasis on semantics in an attempt to describe the size of the gift. Terms such as Major or Leadership usually have to do with the institutional importance or use of the gift. In other words, we like to place more emphasis on what the dollars become and how they are used than with just financial denomination. (Washington & Lee College)

Professional Schools

"Major Gift" prospects are generally those who have at one time contributed a gift of $1,000 or more, hence the $1,000 level. (Clarkson College of Technology)

- STAFFING FOR MAJOR GIFTS

1. Do you have one or more professionals working full time on major gifts?

Yes - 38
No - 28

If yes, how many?

Professionals	Professionals	Professionals
1 - 8	5 - 2	11 - 2
2 - 8	6 - 2	12 - 1
3 - 6	7 - 1	17 - 2
4 - 4	8 - 1	

2. Are you at present in a campaign?
(1 - "planning"; 3 - "perpetual")

Yes - 32
No - 35

If yes, do you expect to retain your major gifts office after the campaign?

Yes - 27
No - 3
Not Applicable - 31

3. Do you have one or more deferred gift professionals on your staff?

Yes - 55
No - 12
1/2 - 1

If yes, how many?

Professionals
1 - 40
2 - 11
3 - 1

Are your deferred gifts officers included in the number of major gift professionals above?

Yes - 24
No - 27

4. If you have no major gift office as such, please check the following people whose positions carry a responsibility for that function.

President/Headmaster	- 37	Deans	- 4
Director of Development	- 29	Faculty	- 1
Trustees/Board Chairman	- 27	F.R. Consultant	- 1
V.P. Development	- 26	Librarian	- 1
Chairman Dev. Comm./ Key Volunteers	- 26	Fdn. V.P./ Legal Counsel	- 1
Development/Field staff	- 11	Ass't Headmaster/ External Affairs	- 1

5. Please add comments or explanations pertinent to your staffing for major gifts.

Private Secondary Schools

We are in the 5th year of campaign for $12,500,000. We are 90% towards this goal. The development office consists of myself, alumni director, 3 full-time clerical, 2 part-time clerical. Our fund-raising consultant has worked with the school for 5 years. (Miss Porter's School)

We are a small school of 400 students and 2,500 alumni. In the development office, we have a director of development, assistant director of development and alumni director. (Belmont Hill School)

This has been a one-man - one-woman office. We are only beginning to "staff-up" for a major campaign effort. (The Thacher School)

We expect to staff for major gift cultivation and solicitation in the near future. (Phillips Academy)

Director of Development has immediate responsibility; always assisted by head of school, trustees, and key volunteers. (The Madeira School)

Assistant to the headmaster is responsible for coordinating major gift program. He works closely with the chairman of the development committee and the board president. (The Hotchkiss School)

I have assistants who help as needed with (a) research (b) special events (c) publications. (University School)

Headmaster and development committee & Board are the key door openers and solicitors. As director of development I organize the forces, strategies, research, etc. (Woodberry Forest School)

27

 C - 9

(contd) - STAFFING FOR MAJOR GIFTS

Private Universities

We see this as a collective responsibility of the president, VPD and trustees. (George Washington University)

Our 9 regional development officers work geographical territory - the total sphere of development work. (Baylor University)

Major gifts are sought by both a central staff and representatives in the seven schools: Business, Law, Medicine, Education, Humanities & Science, Engineering and Earth Sciences. (Stanford University)

Major Gifts Office formed in January 1982, none prior to that time. Forthcoming capital campaign was impetus to create the office. (Duke University)

Our Special Gifts Office (including major and leadership) is concerned with individuals only - comparable corp. and found. gifts are handled through other offices in our organization. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Cornell's major gift fund raising operates under a concept of "primes" and "secondaries" which take advantage of "natural" rather than "imposed" elements of a person's association with the University. Consequently over 100 trustees, faculty, staff, and other friends play a key role in helping build major gifts prospect awareness, knowledge, understanding, caring and involvement which lead to commitment. There are among these 100 plus, 21 persons who serve in the University's major gifts committee, most of whom are major gift givers themselves. (Cornell University)

Though not in a campaign, one is planned for the period 1984-89. In preparation we have assembled a campaign staff (3 now, one to be added) whose basic responsibility is individual major gifts. It is anticipated that this staff will be retained as a major gifts office at the conclusion of the campaign. (Johns Hopkins University)

Public Universities

The University of Delaware is in the final stages of a modest capital effort. Primary responsibility for major gifts before the campaign rested with the president and director of development along with the planned giving officer. During the campaign the director has been the staff liaison with the chairman of the major gifts committee. (University of Delaware)

The executive director of the foundation spends 40% time on major individual gifts in addition to above. (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey)

(contd) - STAFFING FOR MAJOR GIFTS

Public Universities

It will be our next position staffed. (University of Kentucky)

The University centers its fund-raising efforts on major gifts sought from prospects of opportunity. Constituent development officers in schools, colleges, and institutes focus their work on seeking big gifts. The decentralized program is coordinated through a central staff that provides special services such as estate planning aid. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Private Coeducational Colleges

Outside our annual fund office, virtually all efforts (and all staff time) are directed towards major gifts. During the final year of the campaign (84-85) some efforts will be made to solicit smaller gifts ($10-24 M) for capital purposes. (Lafayette College)

Although time is not exclusive to Major Gift fund raising, all development staff ratios time spent to potential return. It follows then that a good portion of time is spent on major gifts. (Hillsdale College)

I believe an effective staff needs technical information and know-how on obtaining major gifts - this is why I'm training all officers (6 at present). (Mercer University)

We have been having some success in combining classmates of prospects with Trustees to form the solicitation terms. (Amherst College)

The V.P. University Relations (me), the Associate V.P Development and the President are the staff involved with major gifts. We chair a special corps of trustees - about 10 who meet regularly to discuss and assign major prospects. (University of Richmond)

We review major prospects and assign the college officer closest to a prospect to be in charge of cultivation and solicitation of him/her. (Middlebury College)

With the exception of 1½ FTE devoted to the annual fund, all field staff have major gift responsibilities (6½ FTE). (Carleton College)

We are in a campaign; thus 7 individuals working full-time on gifts at or above 25,000. 4 of those are holdovers from non-campaign times; 3 have "term" positions. (Colgate University)

(contd) - STAFFING FOR MAJOR GIFTS

Private Men's Colleges

Our major gifts are contemplated and planned for primarily by an ad hoc "committee" consisting of (1) President; (2) V.P. Dev.; (3) Chairman Board; (4) Chairman Dev. Comm. (a trustee). Solicitation personnel depends on individual plans. (Washington & Lee College)

Professional Schools

Historically, our "major gift" emphasis has been on corporate gifts; now we are shifting to a concentration on individuals, and placing greater emphasis on foundation gifts. (Clarkson College of Technology)

Private Women's Colleges

Now being increased in anticipation of a campaign. (Smith College)

Until the present campaign began on June 1, 1982, there was no separate major gifts effort or staff. (Bryn Mawr College)

 - SOLICITATION OF MAJOR GIFTS

1. Whether you have major gift professionals on your staff or not, someone is doing the cultivating and soliciting of your top prospects. Please indicate, as best you can, the order or degree of success the following achieve in the solicitation of your top prospects. Be guided by dollar success. (Rank 1 to 9, 1 being highest total dollars raised)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	No. of Listings out of 68	Weighted Score
Senior Dev. Officer	17	16	12	6	6	2	3	0	1	63	449
Board Chairman	3	11	7	6	10	3	5	4	2	51	285
Dev. Committee Chair	6	6	13	6	7	4	3	1	0	46	291
President	34	13	5	3	6	0	0	3	0	64	499
Major Gift Dev. Officer	6	1	8	5	0	4	3	4	0	36	164
Other Trustees	0	9	6	13	9	7	2	5	5	56	286
Deans	1	3	0	4	3	5	4	8	6	34	126
Other Dev. Committee Vol.	3	3	5	8	8	11	7	5	2	52	257
Deferred Gift Officer	5	5	6	8	5	5	8	0	2	44	246
Other - Camp. Chrm.	1										
Pres. Emeritus		1	1								
Vice Chancellor	1	1									

Scaled Ranking

500 -President

450 -Senior Development Officer

400 -

350 -

300 -Development Committee Chairman
Other Trustees
Board Chairman

250 -Other Dev. Committee Members
Deferred Gift Officer

200 -

-Major Gift Development Officer

150

-Deans

100

31

2. Roughly, what percent of your major gift realization over recent years has come from volunteer solicitation?

0% - 1	25% - 6	50% - 17	80% - 3
5% - 5	30% - 2	60% - 1	90% - 6
10% - 7	33% - 3	67% - 1	100% - 0
20% - 7	40% - 2	70% - 2	

Respondents - 64
Median % - 50%
Unweighted - 39%

Please add your qualifying comments:

Private Secondary Schools

All major gifts have been solicited by volunteers, i.e. Board Chairman with Head of School. Board Chairman with Trustee, Trustee with other person etc. The remaining 10% is due to luck or interference by Dev. Director! (Miss Porter's School)

The Trustees & Campaign Chair are very active without current capital campaign. (Belmont Hill School)

Worked with key volunteers on capital campaign. (Phillips Exeter Academy)

Volunteer leadership are heavily involved in major gift solicitation at Gilman School. Our volunteer campaign leadership and trustee members of our Development Committee are our most active Major Gift solicitors. (Gilman School)

Most have come via voluntary gifts because the giver was involved or knowledgeable about the school's needs. A hefty amount has come as a result of the deaths of income beneficiaries or as a result of a proposal to a foundation where we have "connections." (The Thacher School)

Development Staff is always involved in cultivation, never involved in actual solicitation. (The Madeira School)

This is a very rough estimate and would be hard to substantiate. (The Hotchkiss School)

Probably 50% - but the future might be as low as 25%. Both the headmaster and I have been here for a very short period of time. Therefore, our major gift solicitations have been fewer than will be the case over the next few years. (Deerfield Academy)

Private Secondary Schools

We help as expert witnesses but try to avoid the over-asking. (University School)

Excludes bequests, many of which were written long ago. (The Mercersburg Academy)

Private Coeducational Colleges

We have not done as well involving volunteers as we should. (Pepperdine University)

Low-level development program that is now using and involving volunteers. (Gonzaga University)

Our plan has relied strongly on staff contact with prospects. (Augustana College-Ill)

Our major gift calls are almost always joint - president or other staff and key volunteer. A few major gifts can be credited alone or in largest part to volunteer initiative and effort. (Lawrence University)

Our campaign plan is that all solicitations will be team (2 persons) solicitations preferably by two volunteers. Occasionally the President will accompany a volunteer or I will, and our senior deferred giving person does some on his own, but most are orchestrated by staff but conducted by volunteers. (Lafayette College)

Hard to tell. Joint effort frequently. (Macalester College)

Very few gifts come just from volunteer solicitation but rather from a combination of volunteer and staff. Also, much cultivation usually proceeds the gift and is done by staff. (Louisiana College)

Many major donor prospects come from volunteers - who suggest names and even initiate contacts. Our development office has a fairly sophisticated research system and we surface many prospects ourselves. (Hope College)

Percentage would be much higher if it included involvement. However, most times actual solicitation is handled by staff. (Hillsdale College)

If the president is not considered a volunteer, the above (15%) is probably close. (Davidson College)

We proceed with cultivation with and without volunteers - when we are ready to ask, we always try to have volunteers heavily involved. (Mercer University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

Deferred and Foundation gifts have depended heavily on staff work; outright gifts from individuals and corporate support come about through volunteer solicitation. (Occidental College)

Very hard to qualify. We intentionally put a staff person, or professional with a volunteer whenever and wherever possible and that is because prospective contributors now ask tough questions. (Amherst College)

At least 50% of our major gifts come as a result of staff volunteer team solicitation and cultivation. (University of Richmond)

We had one volunteer, a former Vice President, who did considerable major gift cultivation and solicitation. (Earlham College)

Often combination of volunteer and staff, often, because of bequests, only staff. (Whitman College)

Institution had been oriented toward staff/presidential solicitations. This is slowly changing. (Loyola Marymount University)

We're in a capital campaign. Trustee gifts, which they solicited of each other or volunteered, are a significant part. Otherwise, we have a weakly developed role. (Carleton College)

In the past 18 months, our Board Chairman has personally raised nearly $18 million. We hope his model will stimulate other volunteers. Prior to this, we have been heavily staff-oriented. (Colgate University)

It is difficult to quantify, in fact so difficult that I don't feel an attempt to do so would be anything but misleading. (Vassar College)

Deferred giving is so large a part of our program that the staff component stays high. (Pomona College)

25th and 50th reunions make it high. (Williams College)

The volunteer solicitation rate of 33% includes all gifts to the College except those generated by the President and the Vice President for Institutional Advancement. (Haverford University)

Private Universities

Difficult to pinpoint person responsible. A few volunteers are successful when working with development staff. (Baylor University)

(contd) - SOLICITATION OF MAJOR GIFTS

Private Universities

Most successful major gift solicitation comes from a joint solicitation of staff and volunteer involvement. (Yale University)

There have not been many volunteers asked to assist. The Board members have only recently been asked to help (within the past year). (Duke University)

But this was probably done informally, i.e., not via committee work. (California Institute of Technology)

We assume the President and Deans are not volunteers and trustees are. (Stanford University)

If you mean how many "asks" involve volunteers 50% might be a good figure. If the question were, in what % of cases do volunteers play a key role in bringing about a major gift regardless of whether they were in on the asking, the percentage would be more like 90%. We often have a volunteer with staff (Pres., V.P. or Dean, etc.) join forces in asking. (Cornell University)

The Hopkins Hundred Campaign, concluded in 1976, was more heavily oriented toward volunteer solicitation than has been the case since. Our aim, as we approach a new campaign, is to greatly expand volunteer involvement again. (Johns Hopkins University)

Public Universities

Prior to 1980 probably 80% of major gifts came due to solicitation by a very active volunteer president of foundation board. Since 1980, probably 80% come from staff solicitation. (Ball State University)

Aside from gifts from estates and life income arrangements, major gift realization has been through the campaign and volunteer efforts - (non-corporate & foundations). (University of Delaware)

Key volunteers make original calls on prospects and we use president for close. (University of Kentucky)

Volunteers have been helpful in initial evaluations and preliminary contacts but not active solicitors. (Indiana University)

Volunteers have not been doing substantial work here, in part because the chief advancement officer has unique quasi-volunteer appearance in our state. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Private Women's Colleges

Many gifts come to Wellesley without direct solicitation although cultivation and stewardship have taken place. (Wellesley College)

This 50% is the result of the work of a small nucleus of trustees - about 4 in number. Most of the trustees do not solicit. (Radcliffe College)

Private Men's Colleges

In almost all cases volunteers played vital roles, usually in the cultivation and follow up. Similarly, most of the actual solicitation was done by (1) President; (2) a trustee; (3) development director. (Washington & Lee College)

Professional Schools

Often the solicitation is not by a volunteer but would not have been successful without the volunteer. (Harvey Mudd College)

3. Roughly, what percent of your major gift realization has come from your President?

0% - 1	25% - 7	50% - 13	80% - 3
5% - 1	30% - 2	60% - 5	90% - 1
10% - 11	33% - 1	67% - 0	100% - 2
20% - 9	40% - 5	75% - 2	

Respondents - 63
Median % - 33%
Unweighted Average - 38%

Your Comments:

Private Secondary Schools

Our head went to 22 states in four years to call on prospective donors. He usually went with board chairman or other trustee. Our #1 team. (Miss Porter's School)

Headmaster, non-volunteer, of course, has played a part in virtually all solicitations for major gifts. (The Taft School)

(contd.) - SOLICITATION OF MAJOR GIFTS

Private Secondary Schools

Worked with key volunteers on capital campaign. (Phillips Exeter Academy)

The Headmaster is the most effective major gift solicitor at Gilman School. His long tenure as Headmaster - over 15 years - combined with his familiarity with the Baltimore community are of integral importance. (Gilman School)

He is very effective inasmuch as the trustees are grateful for his abilities and the salutary effect his headmastership has had on the school. If he wants something he usually gets it. (The Thacher School)

Presently not involved in Major Gift solicitation because of recent change of leadership. (The Hotchkiss School)

He asks only selected people of foundations. (University School)

Our new head has been here only a year; hence, it's inappropriate to comment on the above. (Culver Ed. Foundation)

Private Women's Colleges

This is a high estimate - about 1/3 is realized each year unsolicited but is a result of interest and ongoing cultivation and stewardship. (Smith College)

Our President makes almost no personal solicitations but has been responsible for some major gifts. (Radcliffe College)

Private Universities

More and more effective. (Baylor University)

Difficult question to quantify. President has "closed" fewer gifts than staff, but has been responsible for the success of the case; a subtle, yet important, difference. (Yale University)

President holds several key prospects no one else can talk to, but getting president to actually make the ask is difficult.

But note that many final solicitations are via a proposal in the name of the president after visits and discussions by others. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

(contd) - SOLICITATION OF MAJOR GIFTS

Private Universities

The President is involved in the asking for half of the University's major gifts. He is involved in the relationship building which leads to asking in fully 50% of the cases but these are not necessarily the same 50%. By this we mean that in some cases the President is brought in to help do the asking; in other cases, he helps with the cultivation and others may end up doing the asking. (Cornell University)

The President's solicitation efforts are directed primarily to foundations and corporations. (Johns Hopkins University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

President has been chief development officer but this is changing with formation of campaign development committee. (Gonzaga University)

In our plan, the Development staff carries the majority of solicitation efforts outside of highly-organized campaign designs. (Augustana College-Ill.)

The President is frequently involved in cultivation activities and sometimes as a team member with a volunteer. Other times he may make a follow-up call even though not involved directly in the solicitation. (Lafayette College)

50%. Hard to tell. Joint effort frequently. (Macalester College)

He will forward a fairly steady number of names, corporations and foundations to appropriate people for solicitation. (Hope College)

Most major gifts are solicited by President with staff/volunteer involvement. (Hillsdale College)

In many cases with the assistance of the development staff. (Davidson College)

Heavily involved both in cultivation and asking. (Mercer University)

President largely responsible for foundation gifts since campaign inception in 1975 - approximately $18,000,000, larger than any other category. (Occidental College)

Last four Presidents have varied from 90% to 20%. Incoming President will be on the high side. (Amherst College)

Our President is actively engaged in most major gift solicitations - not always, however, as the principal. (University of Richmond)

Private Coeducational Colleges

The President is involved in most major and leadership gift solicitation, at some stage. He is new and I cannot give a percentage of success. (Earlham College)

Varies with president changes; now highly involved. (Whitman College)

The President is used for cultivating approximately 90% of all major prospects. The solicitation is frequently completed by the Vice President (or Development Committee member). (Haverford College)

He plays a major role in grant proposal development as well as major gift solicitations. (Carleton College)

The staff has done most of the solicitation. (Colgate University)

The president's cultivation role is very important and our president does this very well as does his wife. (Pomona College)

Depends very much on whether a campaign is underway and President's involvement in particular projects. (Williams College)

Private Men's Colleges

Virtually every major gift (some bequests excluded) saw the President playing the #1 or #2 role. (Washington & Lee College)

Public Universities

The university president has been very helpful in small group solicitation, but typically has not been directly involved in gift closings on an individual basis due to time constraints. (Ball State University)

The very large public University places inordinate demands on the President. All management functions, including development, are delegated. He does some fund-raising work in selected instances. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

The President of the Foundation also serves as Executive Vice President of the University and has a limited availability of time. (Indiana University)

Professional Schools

He is a presence 100% of the time though not always directly involved. (Harvey Mudd College)

4. Estimate what percent of your major gifts solicitations are made two-on-one.

0% - 1	25% - 2	50% - 12	80% - 7
5% - 2	30% - 2	60% - 3	90% - 4
10% - 6	33% - 1	67% - 3	100% - 5
20% - 2	40% - 1	70% - 8	

Respondents - 59
Median % - 60%
Unweighted Average - 56%

When two-on-one, what is your most successful combination?

President and Other Trustee	18
President and Senior Development Officer	9
President and Development Committee Chairman	7
President and Board Chairman	5
Senior Development Officer and Other Trustee	5
Senior Development Officer and Board Chairman	3
Senior Development Officer and Deans	3
Board Chairman and Other Trustees	3
Volunteer and Staff Member	3

Nine other combinations received
One or two reference

5. Over the past few years, do you feel your volunteer effectiveness in raising gifts has:

Increased - 44
Decreased - 6
Stayed About the Same - 15

6. Please add additional comments on your policies and experiences with regard to the solicitation of major gifts.

Private Secondary Schools

Volunteers need training and confidence - as they succeed they become better solicitors; as they become involved they become better donors. This is not new information - but it works. Volunteers need just as much stewardship as donors! (Miss Porter's School)

Very haphazard to date with dazzling results due to a lot of luck and an enthusiastic group of Trustees. (The Thacher School)

Private Secondary Schools

Peer to peer is the most effective. Your volunteer needs to be a big donor to ask another big donor. (The Westminster School)

Becoming more competitive. Good research essential. (The Cranbrook Schools)

I believe that we will have to rely more on staff people and less on volunteers - unless we can send a staff person to accompany a volunteer. Volunteers are generally very helpful in "getting a foot in the door" of a major gift candidate, but they tend to be less effective when it comes time to "ask for the order." A staff person is often needed at that critical point. (Deerfield Academy)

They're learning and learning to like it. (University School)

Private Women's Colleges

Resource Development Committee volunteers are most comfortable in area $25-$50,000. Over that, a Trustee usually accompanies or the President, usually alone, becomes involved in solicitation. (Smith College)

We have few volunteers who are both willing to solicit and are good at it. (Wellesley College)

Private Coeducational Colleges

Our major and special gift production runs in cycles, depending upon institutional emphasis, utilization of capital campaign programs, time allowed for cultivation of emerging prospects, and changing industrial/economic conditions. (Augustana College-Ill)

We try to pick classmates, business associates, neighbors, friends, of prospects to do solicitations. Our overriding principal is to select the two "best" people to do the solicitation. A staff person does the "ask" only if he is one of the "best" through a special relationship or if we can find no one better qualified. Occasionally I or other senior staff will participate to help train a new volunteer solicitor. (Lafayette College)

Work hard. Plan strategy. Detailed research. Include volunteers in planning. (Mercer University)

Just the obvious: intensive and multi-dimensional research is essential - along with patience. Don't push too hard. The right person making the contact. (Occidental College)

Senior D.O. finds that he is spending more and more time on this to break the log jams. (Amherst College)

Private Coeducational Colleges

We spend a good deal of time "selecting" the right volunteer for calls and in selecting the right prospects for calls! (University of Richmond)

We need to organize ourselves better to use volunteers more, especially trustees. (Earlham College)

Campaign rhetoric and impetus has helped train volunteers. (Whitman College)

The President and Vice President for Institutional Advancement are the College's most effective fund raisers. (Haverford College)

1. Establishment of advisory boards for various colleges/departments. 2. Establishment of Trustee committee on development. 3. Launching first capital campaign. (Loyola Marymount University)

I would have checked off "stayed the same" except for our Board Chairman's work. (Colgate University)

Pomona's program was almost entirely a staff-oriented program. We have been striving to involve volunteers. (Pomona College)

25th and 50th reunion fund mini-capital efforts have increased and honored their effectiveness. (Williams College)

Public Universities

Board involvement along with other peer solicitation is critical. (University of Delaware)

It cannot be overemphasized that we are oriented to staff solicitation of major gifts. Because the University has such a pervasive influence among our constituents, its fund-raising officers have considerable influence and credibility. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Private Universities

Volunteer/staff combination also works well. (Princeton University)

Our staff has been quite successful in strategizing major gift solicitations by the President and the Deans. We feel a real need to increase volunteer activity beyond its current practice of cultivation and thanking by increasing the number of ASKS made by a major gifts volunteer. (Stanford University)

Private Universities

I have checked the above because we have not had a formal volunteer force in recent years. That should change in the future. (checked "Decreased"). (Yale University)

Raising the sights of the volunteers in order to solicit larger gifts has been the most difficult task. (Duke University)

Most volunteers are not effective in asking for the major gift - but very helpful in contacts and staging and joining visits. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

Questions 2 through 5 suggest that the moment of solicitation is the determining factor as to whether a major gift is given. Our experience has been that the prospect's relationship and involvement with the University and the project for which support is sought is the more critical factor. Almost all of Cornell's major gifts (particularly the larger ones) have long histories of planned and unplanned initiatives leading up to their commitment. The most frequent key players are the Presidents, the Vice President for Public Affairs, the Chairman of the Board, the former Chairman of the Board who is now Chairman of University's Major Gifts Committee and a variety of other faculty and staff that include volunteers and occasionally the Director of Development or Director of Major Gifts. Our Major Gifts staff are not professional solicitors, but managers of initiatives that hopefully will lead to individuals making major gifts. (Cornell University)

Private Men's Colleges

Our success has been good and has improved in direct proportion to the time invested in each case. In other words, we know that a good gift can be raised from most major gift prospects; but a major gift can often be raised with patience, planning and the involvement of a "cast" of cultivators and solicitors both staff and volunteer. (Washington and Lee College)

Professional Schools

Just completed a capital campaign with heavy volunteer involvement. (Worcester Polytechnic Institute)

- ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

1. What is your minimum for an endowed professorship?

Under	$250,000	-	3	$400,000	-	1	$ 800,000	-	1
	250,000	-	3	500,000	-	18	1,000,000	-	10
	300,000	-	5	650,000	-	1	1,250,000	-	4
	350,000	-	1	750,000	-	18	1,500,000	-	1

Respondents	66
Median	$750,000
Unweighted Ave.	670,000

For approximately how long has that been your minimum?

1 year	-	8	4 years	-	3	10 years	-	4
2 years	-	20	5 years	-	15	always	-	1
3 years	-	3	6-9 years	-	4			

Is your minimum negotiable? Yes - 38
No - 29

If negotiable, please explain to what degree.

Private Secondary Schools

Need not be outright gift; some outright, bequest, pledge over period of years. (Belmont Hill School)

Min-$400 K (Phillips Exeter Academy)

The minimum is negotiable to the extent that future contributions or contributions from other prospective donors could make up any shortfall. (Gilman School)

We would not turn down a $200,000 gift to endow a teacher's chair (as we call it). (Thacher School)

$350,000 to establish/$500,000 to fill. (The Madeira School)

Plus or minus $50,000. (The Westminster School)

We would be willing to name an endowed chair for $350,000 but feel an announced minimum is more effective. (Hotchkiss School)

Slightly downward (to 250 or 200 depending on prospective donor). (The Cranbrook Schools)

We will establish (and announce) an endowed chair "early" if the chair is 50% funded and the remaining 50% will be received in a relatively short period (i.e. 5 years) of time. (Deerfield Academy)

(contd) - ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

Private Secondary Schools

We negotiate upward - 2/3 are considerably larger. (University School)

This year (83-84) we did negotiate for $400,000. (Chatham Hall)

If chair was being "worked on" before the minimum was raised at $500,000 from $300,000. (Woodberry Forest School)

Professional Schools

We also have endowed assistant professorships, visiting professorships, lectureships (which are funded at a variety of levels). (Worcester Polytechnic Institute)

We did not have an endowed professorship until Fall, 1983. We have no history here. (Clarkson College of Technology)

50%. (Harvey Mudd College)

Public Universities

The period to pay the $100,000 is negotiable. (University of Tennessee)

Somewhat. (Ball State University)

Dependent upon the position to be endowed - e.g. already funded by institution from operating budget vs. new position. (University of Delaware)

There is no precise policy on overall guidelines, we show flexibility that depends on various factors. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Will accept $100,000 if agreement is made to build upon the fund in the immediate future. (Indiana University)

Private Women's Colleges

Minimum has not been negotiable since 1977. Prior to that smaller gifts were accepted frequently. (Bryn Mawr College)

Private Universities

It was until recently. (George Washington University)

Same at $250,000. (Baylor University)

(contd) - ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

Private Universities

A fund can be established for less than $1,000,000, but all income is returned to principal until fund is fully endowed. Fund must be fully endowed in ten-year period. (Duke University)

Except for a somewhat lesser amount separately invested and allowed to accumulate. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

We initially seek $1.25-$1.5 million. Depending on individual circumstances we would accept $750,000 and an understanding that full endowment will be a longer term goal. (Johns Hopkins University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

A letter based on subject area and past record of donor. (Pepperdine University)

Term of funding is negotiable. (Lawrence University)

Only to possibly permit some matching gifts or similar non-personal funds to be used if pre-arranged. (Lafayette College)

If likelihood exists of reaching goal within foreseeable future. (Macalester College)

Could start with smaller amount in conjunction with a planned gift vehicle. (Davidson College)

Only under unusual and extreme circumstances. (Mercer University)

We seek $750K to $1 million, but we have settled for $500K on our recent gift. (Amherst College)

We are now asking (informally) $250,000 or between the two. (Oklahoma City University)

$250,000 if the donor agrees to add over the years. (University of Richmond)

We have had to settle for less after announcing the fund drive for the professorship - not enough came in, but considerable enough that it could not be ignored. (Earlham College)

$500,000 to $1,000,000. (Haverford College)

If additional financial support is anticipated, partial endowment accepted. (Loyola Marymount University)

We will establish a named professorship for less if the initial gift will attract additional support. (Middlebury College)

SURVEY (contd) - ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

Private Coeducational Colleges

We try to combine $750,000 for chair with a supplemental of $250,000 for faculty development. (Carleton College)

We'll take as little as $500,000 when that's all we can get. We have only identified 46 million-dollar prospects, so we'll have to be flexible on our "rule." (Colgate University)

Would depend on individual situation. (Vassar College)

We'll start at a lower number if a donor or family expresses the intention of completing the job. (Pomona College)

But minimum amount may be pledged or anticipated over a period of years. (Williams College)

2. Do you have two or more classes of endowed professorships? Yes - 23
No - 44

If so, please explain the description and price differential.

Private Secondary Schools

$300,000 = endowed teacher. A $1 million gift endowed the position of academic dean. (Miss Porter's School)

A named chair for one faculty member and a teaching endowment supporting more than one teacher. (Hotchkiss School)

Each separately negotiated. (University School)

Teaching endowment or chair - $500,000; Mastership - $150,000 (probably will to $250,000). (Woodberry Forest School)

Public Universities

$100,000 for an endowed professorial salary supplement. $500,000 for a fully endowed professorship. (University of Tennessee)

$750,000 - full professorship. $25,000 minimum - supplementary prof. (Ball State University)

Visiting, Junior, and Senior Faculty. (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey)

Endowed chair - $750,000; Endowed professorship - $500,000. (University of Kentucky)

(contd) - ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

Public Universities

There are (1) endowed chairs and (2) endowed professorships. A named chair requires a $1,000,000 gift and a professorship goes as low as $300,000. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

A fully endowed chair requires $1,000,000. (Indiana University)

Private Universities

$250,000 Assistant Prof. $500,000 Full Prof. $750,000 Distinguished Prof. $1,000,000 University Prof. $250,000 Visiting Prof. (George Washington University)

Baylor Professorship and other named $750,000 for endowed chair. (Baylor University)

Incremental professorships are $1.5 million; non-incremental professorships are $1 million. (Stanford University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

Endowed professorship ($800,000) and endowed chair ($1,000,000). (Lafayette College)

A number funded by a major donor at less than $750,000. (Macalester College)

Endowed chair - $500,000; Visiting prof. - $50,000; Lectureship - $25,000; Department - $1,000,000. (Louisiana College)

Endowed at $750,000 (no perquisites). Distinguished at $1,000,000 - perquisites (non-current). (Occidental College)

Just one. But historically some were not at all well-funded initially. (Amherst College)

$100,000 - Professorships; $250,000 - Distinguished Prof. (Oklahoma City University)

We have "endowed positions" for faculty additions of junior people at $250,000 - but not named professorships. (Whitman College)

$500,000 and over; $250,000-$300,000. (Loyola Marymount University)

For this campaign, we plan two levels: $1,000,000 (full), $500,000 (associate). (Colgate College)

We have distinguished - college-wide professorships for $1 million. (Pomona College)

- ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

Private Women's Colleges

Endowed professorship $750,000; endowed professorship with support funds - $1 million. (Bryn Mawr College)

Fully funded and partially funded (older ones). (Wellesley College)

Professional Schools

Those that were funded a generation or more ago - vs. those funded today. (Worcester Polytechnic Institute)

3. Do you have a policy for when an endowed chair will be funded? Yes - 33
No - 33

If so: at time of pledging - 5
when x% funded - 13
33% - 1
50% - 9
75% - 1
negotiable - 1
circumstances dictate - 1
not until fully funded - 21

(several footnoted "policy flexible in the case of existing positions.")

Do you fill a chair now for a gift made subject to life income reserved? Yes - 12
No - 41

(Footnotes include: "negotiable," "if 1/3 is non-deferred," and "if non-incremental.")

Do you fill a chair now for a documented bequest provision? Yes - 3
No - 47

4. Do you market endowments for other than full professorships? see below

5. Do you market endowments for other purposes or programs and at what size? see below

6. Further comments.

Questions 4, 5, and 6 on Page 6 of the Survey are open-ended, and resulted in multiple listings of a full spectrum of endowment funds promoted. Over 90% of the respondents listed at least one other fund actively marketed, beyond professorships. The range of names, as well as purposes, is broad. So is the range of prices.

- ENDOWED PROFESSORSHIPS AND OTHER SPECIFIC ENDOWMENTS

The list includes names, with prices or ranges as listed:

Distinguished professorship	At a premium price
Professorships with support funds	At a premium price
Associate professorship	$350,000
Distinguished assistant professorship	$350,000-$500,000
Assistant professorship	$250,000
Faculty fellows	$600,000
Junior faculty endowments	$600,000-$750,000
Junior faculty fellowships	$250,000-$350,000
Visiting professorships	$250,000; $500,000-$750,000
Director of libraries	$1,000,000
Directorships - of centers, libraries, programs	$750,000-$1,500,000
Pre-doctoral/post doctoral fellowships	$250,000-$350,000
Instructor	$250,000
Head coach	$800,000
Mastership	$1,000,000
Visiting artist funds	$25,000-$250,000
Senior research scholars	$500,000
Research fellowships	$200,000-$400,000
Lectureships	Various prices
Master teacher fund	$25,000
Named faculty salary endowments	$100,000 - department designated
Named faculty salary endowments	$50,000 - department undesignated
Faculty enrichment funds	$100,000 and up
Faculty support funds	$5,000; $250,000
Department support funds	$10,000; $100,000
Faculty study grants	$100,000
Faculty development funds	$250,000; $500,000
Fellowships	$300,000
Merit fellowships	$250,000; $25,000-$100,000
Research funds	Various prices
Post doctorals	$500,000
Internships	$100,000-$250,000
Nursing funds	$1,000,000
Scholarships	$25,000; $100,000; $250,000
Student aid funds	$10,000 and up
Honor scholarships	$150,000
Scholarship/loan funds	Various prices
Named unrestricted endowments	$10,000 and up
Annual gift endowments	$5,000 and up
Presidential discretionary fund	$700,000
Special program endowments	$250,000
Building fund	$1,000,000
Building operations/maintenance funds	$50,000 and up
Equipment funds	$25,000 and up
Scientific equipment funds	$10,000 and up
Book/library funds	$5,000; $10,000 and up
Acquisition/preservation funds	$5,000-$100,000
General College Fiscal Stability Fund	Flexible
Prize fund endowments	Various prices
Prize or honor funds	$5,000 minimum

Some institutions mentioned minimums for either endowed funds, or named endowments, generally $5,000 or $10,000.

1. To name a building, what percent of its cost must be covered by a gift?

no policy	- 13	60%	- 3
33%	- 4	67%	- 1
50%	- 14	75%	- 4
greater than 50% (many said 51%)	- 14		

Respondents 53
Median % 50%

If you have no specific policy in that regard, what is your practice? Or, given your policy, to what extent is it negotiable?

Private Secondary Schools

$100,000 for dormitories, $300,000 for arts/science center - are all set. Others will be figured in 1:1 basis. Will have to increase in future as costs rise. (Miss Porter's School)

This issue has never been faced at Gilman School. My assumption is that we would look for a gift approaching 50 percent of the total cost of the building. (Gilman School)

Half plus $1. Not negotiable (yet!). (The Madeira School)

Usually 100%; however, we have done it for less - normally 75% of the cost of the building. (The Hotchkiss School)

We seek no buildings. (University School)

We named our new science building for the challenge gift donor who provided 1/3 of the construction costs. Has been negotiable. However, a policy will be established for our centennial campaign, which is being planned now. (The Thacher School)

Upon completion of project, significant support from one major donor would then be considered for naming. (The Cranbrook Schools)

One-half of construction costs or one million dollars - depends on project. (Chatham Hall)

We try to get 100% but fall back to 51%. (Culver Educational Foundation)

No building has taken place in 12 years - there is no hard and fast policy. (The Mercersburg Academy)

Public Universities

For a major building to be named for a person - a minimum gift, $1,000,000. A small structure may be named for a smaller gift. (University of Tennessee)

To my knowledge, we have never named a building to honor a donor - only to honor outstanding service to the university. So, I can't answer these questions. (Ball State University)

Undecided. (University of Florida)

We have no fixed policy. Circumstances vary based on the type of building and its total financing method. For example, a hospital and alumni center are differently treated. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Variable - dependent upon extent of involvement of donor and relationship to university. Board policy normally does not allow named facility for living individual. (University of Delaware)

New buildings at least 1/2 the value. Existing facilities must be comparable to previously named building gifts (age, square feet, desirability). Negotiable. (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey)

The University has a Names Committee that considers each situation separately. (Indiana University)

Private Universities

Has been decided on a case-by-case basis. Policy under review. Highly negotiable. (George Washington University)

Depends - 75% to 100% prepaid. Very negotiable. (Baylor University)

Usually 50%, however, there are numerous exceptions. Our policy is not necessarily negotiable in a strict sense. It is tailored to fit each situation. (Stanford University)

Negotiable. We have had no new buildings in five years and plan none. More interested in renovation monies. (Yale University)

New buildings - 1/2 cost. Existing building (unnamed) 1/2 cost of major renovation, or if activities within building are endowed. Negotiable, particularly on existing buildings. (Duke University)

No policy. Half, with the remainder in sight, but negotiable according to circumstances. (California Institute of Technology)

Private Universities

Negotiable a little, but not a lot. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

No specific policy. We try to have 50% from one donor for naming a facility. We have named facilities for gifts of 1/4 - 1/3 cost of building. (Cornell University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

50% of building cost plus 50% of estimated maintenance endowment cost. We have recently turned down major offers for less than 50%. We have received as much as 100%. (Lafayette College)

"Up for grabs," depending on donor's past and future generosity. Just did a pool at 60%, but donor has given college $2.5 million. (Macalester College)

Varies. The practice in the past is not easy to explain. (Mercer University)

Informally, at least 33-1/3%. Not specific policy. (Oklahoma City University)

Most recent case (1976), $1.3 million named a $3.6 million library. We'd like to do better than that. (Lawrence University)

A gift of $500,000. (Louisiana College)

No specific policy. In some cases 50% - in other cases, try for the majority. Buildings are named after those men and women who have been instrumental in the college's success, and this is not dependent upon money. (Hope College)

Negotiable taking history of relationship with College into account. (Hillsdale College)

Fairly frequently I'm afraid. (Davidson College)

Not currently negotiable, although it has been in the past (18 years). (Occidental College)

Below 60% not at all negotiable. (Amherst College)

Usually 51%, but sometimes the Board names the building for other reasons than donor investment. Negotiable. If a building has the funds from many sources and needs one big gift, a donor might be offered the chance to name the building or portion thereof. (Earlham College)

Private Coeducational Colleges

Rule of thumb. Negotiable, greatly, if donor has big record with us of past gifts without recognition, otherwise 1/3 to 1/2 is usual. (Whitman College)

No specific policy. 75% to 90% of the cost should be covered by the gift. (Haverford College)

We have no specific policy in this area. However, practice in recent history has been to name buildings for less than half their cost. We are working toward raising the cost of naming a facility - to cover more of the construction and maintenance costs. (Middlebury College)

A large portion, over half certainly. (Carleton College)

To deal with each case individually. (Vassar College)

We named a $3.2 million library for a $1.5 million gift. (Pomona College)

Suppose anything is negotiable, but we have "sold" space too cheaply. (Williams College)

Professional Schools

We are aiming for 75-80% for new construction - and 60% for major renovations (retrofitting). (Worcester Polytechnic Institute)

At least 25%, if situation is apropos. Several buildings have been named in recent years - all were 80-100% funded by one individual. (Clarkson College of Technology)

Private Women's Colleges

Presidential discretion - as close to 100% as possible but certainly over 50%. (Smith College)

Varies - during this campaign alone we have one donor who paid for entire cost - another who paid 33%. (Bryn Mawr College)

Varies as to building. We have set price tags for areas - i.e. wings, rooms, etc. Prices are set based upon building/renovation costs, endowed maintenance, and desirability of area. (Wellesley College)

Private Women's Colleges

No policy. We have named buildings for their major donor (more than 50% of cost). Very negotiable. We also name property of various kinds in honor of esteemed members of our community. (Radcliffe College)

Private Men's Colleges

Our policy is that a gift of one-half the value, or more, is necessary for naming that figure (min. std) and is published as a result of Board action. Not negotiable. (Washington & Lee College)

2. In pricing a building, do you include an endowment for operating and/or maintenance? Yes - 28 No - 38

In practice, is your effort to raise such an endowment working?

Private Secondary Schools

We have built no new buildings in past 7 years. In future building endowment will be included. (Miss Porter's School)

Yes. The trustees feel very strongly about this. (Belmont Hill Academy)

Too new to tell. (Phillips Exeter Academy)

It is a recognized policy or regularly stated rule. However, like all rules we break it continually. (The Thacher School)

Yes, we build in 50% of the construction cost as a maintenance fund. That cost is considered part of the project's budget. No building is done without it. (The Madeira School)

We are not working on raising facilities, as the campus is fully built at this time. In past decade, we have raised over $5 million for plant additions. (The Hotchkiss School)

Difficult to get understanding of need by prospects. (The Cranbrook Schools)

We will if we decide to build. (University School)

I hope we can include such a program. (Chatham Hall)

This is a campaign decision, its efficacy remains to be proved. (Culver Educational Foundation)

Private Secondary Schools

The maintenance of our dining hall (circa 1965) is partially endowed. (The Mercersburg Academy)

Public Universities

The State of Tennessee provides state funds for operation and maintenance. (University of Tennessee)

In theory, however, not much experience to draw conclusion from. (University of Delaware)

Undecided. (University of Florida)

This is difficult money to raise. (Indiana University)

Private Universities

Yes (recent change). (Baylor University)

Have never had much success at this. (Princeton University)

If we were raising monies for a building, we would include an endowment. (Yale University)

We try to raise operating endowment for buildings, but as a separate item. It has worked on two new buildings and not at all on a new student union. (Duke University)

Yes, it is part of the total cost but raising building funds is hard, hard, hard. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

This is working reasonably well. (Cornell University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

We're endeavoring to build this into cost (i.e. heat and water, repairs, personnel). (Gonzaga University)

We intend to move in the direction of such endowments in the future. (Augustana College-Ill.)

Yes. In our current campaign all building objectives are handled this way, and we have been quite successful to date. (Lafayette College)

But we would like to! (Macalester College)

Private Coeducational Colleges

But we talk about it, and probably should. (Hope College)

Yes, such funds are included in General College endowment efforts. (Hillsdale College)

Somewhat. (Davidson College)

We have not done so in the past, but expect to do so in the future. (Occidental College)

No. Not everyone is willing. Foundations are a good example. With our endowment performance up significantly many donors and prospects are inclined to think this is our problem not theirs. (Amherst College)

We do, however, now attempt to raise endowments for this purpose. We do not make it mandatory as we erect new facilities. We are examining this policy. (Oklahoma City University)

Limited success! (University of Richmond)

We'd like to and often talk of it. (Whitman College)

We have been allocating unrestricted funds for this purpose. (Haverford College)

Yes. Most recent example was library renovation and expansion. Construction $7.5 million, building endowment $3 million. Completed. (Carleton College)

We haven't in the past, but plan to in this campaign. We have no experience to tell us if we've succeeded or not. (Colgate University)

Two new buildings - one with endowment for maintenance. (Pomona College)

Yes, goal always includes cost of new maintenance endowment by Trustee policy. We raise it or apply it. (Williams College)

Professional Schools

We're going to put such a practice in place for future construction. Yes, three new buildings (total cost $17 million funded by gifts in last 3 years). (Worcester Polytechnic Institute)

We are considering this. It's certainly desirable, but we'd be interested in the response of others to this question. (Clarkson College of Technology)

Relatively new policy - working. (Harvey Mudd College)

Private Women's Colleges

Not yet - but we will certainly continue pricing policy. (Bryn Mawr College)

Yes. People are concerned about endowment and understand the need. (Wellesley College)

Private Men's Colleges

In the past 10 years we have built 5 new buildings. Three of the five have attracted "naming gifts." (From $500,000 to $9 million.) (Washington & Lee College)

3. Are you finding it easier or more difficult to raise funds for facilities?

easier	-	19
more difficult	-	21
about the same	-	12

4. Please add comments which further describe your policies with regard to gifts for facilities.

Private Secondary Schools

Our next campaign "90's fund" will most likely include building. The current one "80's fund" did not so I cannot speak to this point. Usually buildings are "sexier" than endowment funds so I assume they will be easier to raise funds for. (Miss Porter's School)

We are finding endowment harder to raise (donor concern about small, though deliberate return for growth); easier to raise bricks and mortar, easier still to raise renovation or relocation funds when plans show a commitment to effective use of space. Parents like facilities, alumnae like faculty salaries/scholarships. (The Madeira School)

Trustees and major donors better understand the need for endowment, but most people still prefer to have their name on a prominent and tangible building. (The Hotchkiss School)

Offer named gift opportunities within a larger facility. Recognize donors with permanent plaque. (The Cranbrook Schools)

Our physical plant is perceived as one which doesn't need major additions. It is my firm belief that it will be easier for Deerfield to raise $ in support of people (i.e., salaries, financial aid, sabbaticals, etc.) than for facilities. (Deerfield Academy)

We find endowments popular. Somewhat to our surprise. (University School)

Private Secondary Schools

Chatham Hall is in a period of building a strong development program and so many of my answers are predicated on what we hope to accomplish within the realm of major gifts. (Chatham Hall)

We are in the eyes of our alumni, over-built. Hence, feeling prevails that we need no more facilities. (Culver Educational Foundation)

Private Women's Colleges

They become mini-campaigns geared to special projects, usually with identified interest in that area. Example: libraries, athletic facilities. Completed substantially by foundation grants. (Smith College)

I do not feel it is easier or more difficult to raise funds for facilities. Just as foundations vary in guidelines, so do donors. We have some who prefer to support programs, some who prefer hardware and an increasing number give for unrestricted purposes. (Bryn Mawr College)

We are just completing a capital campaign. We raised very little in specific funds for capital improvements. Most donors preferred to give unrestricted funds. We exceeded our goal of $10,000,000 by about $1,000,000 but did not meet any of our specific program or capital improvement objectives. (Radcliffe College)

Public Universities

We will name rooms, labs, and other space for gifts of varying amounts depending on the cost of the space. (University of Tennessee)

No firm policies established: with exception that gifts of retained life interest and unfulfilled pledge normally doesn't qualify - with "Bricks & Mortar" primarily concentrate on funds in hand - endowment varies. (University of Delaware)

Not attempting to raise funds for facilities, but will in the near future. (University of South Florida)

Being a state/public university, the general attitude is that facilities should be provided by state/tax dollars. Individuals are becoming more aware that is not always the case. (University of Kentucky)

In practice we approach any potential major gift for a building (or substantial portion of it) as a special circumstance. Generally we are trying to get gifts in a very pragmatic fashion. Yet we recognize that sometimes gifts have a negative financial impact and we pass them on. (University of Minnesota Foundation)

Public Universities

In our approaching campaign, the thrust of the priorities will be for endowed funds of various kinds. We will have a better knowledge of donor preferences after some months have gone by into this project. (Indiana University)

Private Universities

I have been here for two months, succeeding a VPD who was here 14 years. I am only beginning to learn the history of past practice and virtually everything is being reconsidered. My responses should be considered in this light. (George Washington University)

Cal Tech has traditionally been successful in raising money for buildings. We will probably shift emphasis and focus on rehabilitation for the coming four to six years. (California Institute of Technology)

Bricks and Mortar just aren't selling. (Princeton University)

We have focused efforts lately, and unsuccessfully to get a bill passed allowing a bond issue to finance a new dormitory. We recently funded and built a new business school and engineering library. We built but did not fully fund an $18 million student union. A new dorm awaits the hope for bond issue - no private gifts forthcoming to go forward. (Duke University)

The cost of facilities vis-a-vis the capacity of individual donors to cover 1/2 of building is an increasingly more difficult problem. We plan to try to use this situation to raise sights of individual donors who see $1 million as a "top-level" gift but who have capacity to make commitments well above that amount. (Cornell University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

We seek gifts only as a sound case can be made for the facility in terms of purposes and benefits related to its use. (Augustana College-Ill.)

The history of donor controls a lot of factors such as manner of solicitation, naming, etc. Such a survey, confined to new donors would beget different answers. (Whitman College)

We have been raising money to renovate existing facilities rather than to construct new buildings. We will name rooms in the renovated facilities in honor of donors. (Haverford College)

We are certainly not innovative. We market rooms and/or "spaces" at various dollar levels. (Colgate University)

Private Coeducational Colleges

If the case is well made to the right properly cultivated prospects, we seem to be equally successful at raising funds for facilities and endowment. Our alumni, the source of our greatest support, understand and support the need for endowment that keeps growing. (Williams College)

Private Men's Colleges

We have numerous interior "opportunities" in new buildings, such as rooms, offices, etc. We have been reasonably successful in identifying outside areas for namings, such as courtyards, plazas, etc. We will name a physical unit for an endowment gift if the donor prefers. (Washington & Lee College)

Professional Schools

As an engineering college we have a continuing demand for new, improved, updated facilities. Donors recognize this and respond to it. (Harvey Mudd College)